

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-14 are now pending in this application. In the August 11, 2004 office action, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,986 to Follingstad et al. (hereinafter "*Follingstad*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,483,029 to Lutz (hereinafter "*Lutz*"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,398,161 to Roy (hereinafter "*Roy*"). Claims 10 and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Prior Art Rejections:

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. The Office Action cites *Lutz* for teaching the outer housing recited by claim 1. However, *Lutz* does not teach a shielding chamber as defined by claim 1, and consequently cannot teach "an outer housing encompassing the shielding chamber" as recited by claim 1.

Additionally, *Lutz* does not teach "an outer housing having a first cover surface that is substantially parallel to but within a different spatial plane from the first horizontal surface" as recited by claim 1. The Office Action states that *Lutz* teaches an "outer housing having a first cover surface (114) that is parallel to the inner housing." Page 4, lines 4-5. The Office Action identified the inner housing as reference number 102. Page 3, line 17. However, column 3, lines 7-8 of *Lutz* states that "housing 102 . . . includes a top 114." The applicants submit that surface 114 is a component of housing 102 and cannot therefore be parallel to itself, particularly "within a different spatial plane" with itself. *Lutz* does not teach a first cover surface and a horizontal surface that are substantially parallel but within a different spatial plane. Both *Follingstad* and *Lutz* teach a single housing rather than a shielding chamber and outer housing.

Further, neither *Lutz* nor *Follingstad* teaches “a chassis ground conductor electrically connected to the shielding chamber and the ground conductor of the vertical backplane” as recited by claim 1. *Lutz* shows flexible connectors 202 that electrically couples the circuit card connectors to the backplane. *Lutz* does not discuss ground conductors. Since *Lutz* does not teach a shielding chamber or ground conductors, *Lutz* cannot teach a ground conductor of the chassis that is electrically connected to the shielding chamber and to the vertical backplane.

There is nothing disclosed within either reference that suggests a motivation to combine the two chassis such that an outer housing encompasses a shielding chamber with an airspace between the two. Even if it were desirable to reduce the outside radiation and noise, as suggested by the Office Action but not the references, it would not have been obvious to create the structure recited by claim 1 from the separate teachings of single housing devices as disclosed by *Follingstad* and *Lutz*. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 2. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Lutz* does not teach cover surfaces substantially parallel to but within a different spatial plane from other horizontal surfaces. Further, *Lutz* does not teach a surface having a plurality of holes substantially parallel to a horizontal surface. For at least these reasons, and because claim 2 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 3

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 3. Because claim 3 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 3 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 4. The Office Action equates reference number 110 of *Lutz* with the faceplate recited by claim 4. However, reference number 110 corresponds to circuit cards. The circuit cards are not “substantially parallel to but within a different spatial plane from the vertical backplane” as recited by claim 4. The circuit cards taught by *Lutz* are not for “contacting telecommunications modules installed in the chassis” as recited by claim 4. Finally, the circuit cards taught by *Lutz* do not have “an aperture for receiving telecommunications modules” as recited by claim 4. *Lutz* does not teach any structure with these recited claim elements. For at least these reasons, and because claim 4 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 4 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz* and further in view of *Roy*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 5. Because claim 5 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 5 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz* and *Roy*.

Dependent Claim 6

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 6. The cited combination does not teach a handle rotatably mounted to the outer housing. The Office Action referred to reference number 108 of *Lutz* as being equivalent to the recitations of claim 6. However, reference number 108 is not a handle and is not rotatably mounted to the housing. For at least these reasons, and because claim

6 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 6 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 7

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 7. Because claim 7 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 7 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 8. As discussed above with respect to dependent claim 4, the cited art fails to teach a faceplate. For at least this reason, and because claim 8 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 8 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 9

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 9. Because claim 9 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 9 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 10

Claim 10 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The applicants submit that because claim 10 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 10 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 11

Amendment And Response
Serial No. 09/812,226

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 11. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Lutz* does not teach a chassis ground conductor conductively connected to the outer housing. For at least this reason, and because claim 11 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 11 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 12. The Office Action cites *Lutz* for teaching the recitations of claim 12. However, *Lutz* does not teach, “the repeater modules having circuitry enclosed within a shell, the shell having a first shell surface for engaging the first horizontal surface and a second shell surface for engaging the second horizontal surface” as recited by claim 12. *Lutz* describes a chassis containing circuit cards 110. *Lutz* does not describe circuitry within a shell, with the shell having two surfaces for engaging the first and second horizontal surfaces respectively. A circuit card does not imply circuitry enclosed within a shell. For at least this reason, and because claim 12 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 12 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 13

Claim 13 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The applicants submit that because claim 13 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 13 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

Dependent Claim 14

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*. The applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination fails to teach,

suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 14. The Office Action refers to a disclosure in *Lutz* concerning the suitable material for mounting ears 108. The applicants submit that mounting ears 108 are not equivalent to the top and bottom horizontal surfaces. *Lutz* does not disclose top and bottom surfaces having a zinc chromate plating. For at least this reason, and because claim 12 further limits allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 14 is allowable over *Follingstad* in view of *Lutz*.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC



Date: November 9, 2004

By: Leonard J. Hope
Reg. No. 44,774

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

